

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 were pending in the application at the time the last Office Action was mailed. No claims are amended, cancelled or added by this response. Accordingly, claims 1-32 remain pending.

The last Office Action rejected claims 1-32 as being unpatentable. More specifically, the status of the claims in light of the last Office Action are as follows:

- 1) claims 1-8, 10-14, 16-22, and 24-27 were rejected over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,584 ("Bunney") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,754 ("Isaacs");
- 2) claims 9, 15, 23, and 28 were rejected over the combination of Bunney and Isaacs in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,609 and U.S. Patent No. 6,480,593;
- 3) claims 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Isaacs.

According to the last Office Action, Isaacs teaches or suggests that a user can be "logged on" to multiple devices simultaneously. See, e.g., Office Action, pages 4, 10, 12, and 16. Without commenting on or conceding the merits of the rejection over Isaacs, the applicants would like to point out that their application has a priority date that is earlier than Isaacs for the proposition that a user can be logged onto multiple devices simultaneously. Isaacs was filed on July 5, 2000 and claimed the benefit of a provisional patent application filed on February 22, 2000. However, Isaacs' provisional patent application does not appear to teach or suggest that a user can be logged onto multiple devices simultaneously.

In contrast, the applicants' patent application was filed on August 31, 2000 and claimed the benefit of a provisional patent application filed on February 29, 2000. The applicants' provisional patent application indicates that a user can be logged onto multiple devices simultaneously, such as at pages 1-2.

Because Isaacs' provisional patent application filed on February 22, 2000 does not provide support for the proposition that a user can be logged on to multiple devices simultaneously, the priority date for such a proposition in Isaacs, if support exists at all, is July 5, 2000. Thus, because the applicants' provisional application filing date of February 29, 2000 predates Isaac's effective reference date of July 5, 2000, Isaacs cannot be used as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). See MPEP § 2136.02.

Because the pending claims recite a novel combination of elements that is neither taught nor suggested by the applied references, the applicants submit that their claims are allowable over the applied references. In view of the above remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268883US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

Aug. 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rajiv P. Sarathy

Registration No.: 55,592

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorneys for Applicant